

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 3-12 are pending for consideration.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 3-11 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER ROBERTSON (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,609,106) IN VIEW OF WATTS (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,327,623)

Amended claim 1 recites evaluating contents of access to the information brokering server by a user based upon an evaluation value determined by a predetermined evaluation function, the evaluation function analyzing an information search action by the user and contents of information brokered to the user. Amended claims 9-12 recite somewhat similar features. Robertson and Watts, both individually and in combination, fail to disclose the above feature.

Robertson discusses an online gift registry and reminder system that allows consumers to register gifts or items of interest in a centralized "Wish List" database. See column 1, lines 11-13, of Robertson. A brokering site may store certain user-specific customization information that can be used by Service Providers to tailor their respective services to individual users. See column 13, lines 7-10, of Robertson. Any user, registered or not, may use a Gift Registry to purchase a gift on a user's Wish List. See column 18, lines 34-37, of Robertson.

Robertson is silent as to evaluating contents of access to the information brokering server by a user based upon an *evaluation value* determined by a *predetermined evaluation function*. Robertson merely stores user-specific customization information that may be used for marketing purposes. See column 13, lines 27-32, of Robertson. Watts is also silent as to this feature.

Claim 1 further recites that the service providing server comprises an incentive adjusting part adjusting contents of an incentive to be given to the user based on the user access information notified from the information brokering server, in a case of receiving an information providing a request from the user of the user terminal. Robertson and Watts, both individually and in combination, fail to disclose this feature.

The Office Action contends that column 13, lines 1-35, of Robertson discloses this feature, without providing reasoning. The cited section of Robertson concerns collecting marketing information. For instance, a Service Provider site may use marketing information to

make highly popular items more visible on the site and offer special rates to entice customers to buy. See column 13, lines 27-32, of Robertson. However, Robertson does not disclose adjusting the contents of an incentive based on *user access information* from an information brokering server when the service providing server *receives a request* from a user terminal. Watts is also silent as to this feature. Thus, Robertson and Watts, both individually and in combination, fail to render claim 1 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The above comments are specifically directed to claim 1. However, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding various differences of various other claims over the cited art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 13, 2007

By: /Michael A. Leonard II/
Michael A. Leonard II
Registration No. 60,180

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501